SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW Y	ORK	v
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., I		: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :
SOLAS OLED LTD., et al.,	Defendants.	: ORDER :
SAMSUNG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,	Plaintiff,	· : : :
-against-		:
SOLAS OLED LTD., et al.,	Defendants.	: : : - X

## LORNA G. SCHOFIELD, District Judge:

LINITED STATES DISTRICT COLIDT

WHEREAS, on September 21, 2021, Defendants filed a motion to seal portions of their memorandum of law in support of the motion to dismiss or transfer. (Dkt. No. 50 in 21 Civ. 5205, Dkt. No. 19 in 21 Civ. 7201.)

WHEREAS, on October 12, 2021, Plaintiffs filed a motion to seal portions of their memorandum of law in opposition to the motion to dismiss or transfer. (Dkt. No. 57 in 21 Civ. 5205, Dkt. No. 36 in 21 Civ. 7201).

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2021, Defendants filed a motion to seal portions of their reply in support of the motion to dismiss or transfer. (Dkt. No. 64 in 21 Civ. 5205, Dkt. No. 47 in 21 Civ. 7201.) It is hereby

**ORDERED** that, the motions to seal are **GRANTED**. The unredacted versions of the memoranda of law will remain sealed, and only the parties and individuals identified in the in the appendix at Dkt. No. 64 in 21 Civ. 5205, Dkt. No. 47 in 21 Civ. 7201 will have access. Although

"[t]he common law right of public access to judicial documents is firmly rooted in our nation's history," this right is not absolute, and courts "must balance competing considerations against" the presumption of access. Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga, 435 F.3d 110, 119-20 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns., Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978) ("[T]he decision as to access is one best left to the sound discretion of the trial court, a discretion to be exercised in light of the relevant facts and circumstances of the particular case."). Filing the above-referenced memoranda in redacted form is necessary to prevent the unauthorized dissemination of confidential business information. It is further

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close the motion at Dkt. Nos. 50, 57, and 64 in 21 Civ. 5205 and Dkt. Nos. 19, 36, and 47 in 21 Civ. 7201.

Dated: March 1, 2022

New York, New York

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE